1:Redfield E-5 (1926-1927)1930
NU37 Tepoztlan NU37

ter regions. Therefore there are many villages, walled away one from another by the complicated mountains and lying one above the other on the steps of the stairway. Morelos is, indeed, one of the most densely populated states of Mexico.[1] But the population is one of small villages; there is no town with more than ten thousand inhabitants, and three-quarters of the people live in villages of less than two thousand.[2]

The state is entirely agricultural; there is practically no industry. Before the Conquest it was the seat of many Indian villages; these were united in loose economic and political federations, but each had its own patriotism and its own communal lands. The *hacienda* system, which had for its excuse in the north the geographic facts of an unpopulated region with few resources of water supply, lacked similar excuses in Morelos until the introduction of sugar cane. Sugar cane demands the construction of irrigation works and crushing machinery and so requires large-scale production. Because of this (and because of the early assignment of large groups of villages to individual conquerors as *encomiendas*), by 1910 the *hacienda* system had developed further in Morelos than anywhere else; indeed practically all the land belonged to the large estates of a few individuals.[3] Sugar made Morelos a

[1] In 1910, 84.7 inhabitants per square mile, and seventh in density of population among Mexican states, according to the computation from census figures of Wallace Thompson, *The People of Mexico*, p. 72.

[2] McBride, *Land Systems of Mexico*, p. 144.

[3] McBride says that only 140 of 28,000 heads of families were individual property-holders. One large *hacendado* owned seven times as much land as there was in all the small farms (under 1,000 *hectares*), in the state (*op. cit.*, pp. 143–44).

1:Redfield E-5 (1926-1927) 1930
NU37 Tepoztlan NU37

Sugar made Morelos a 175
contributor to the wealth of Mexico, but it reduced 249
the population to landless peonage. The revolution 423
which began in 1910, especially in Morelos, may be 669
regarded as the conflict between two social-economic systems: the one an ancient Indian tradition of self-sufficient and independent villages enjoying corporate land tenure, and the other a new capitalistic system of large-scale production of a money crop contributory to a world-economy. The agrarian reforms following the revolution broke up some of these estates. Others were kept together and operated by the state in an attempt to preserve the sugar plantations; but many lands where sugar was once grown have reverted to maize.

The northern border of Morelos lies along a part of 133
the rampart which hems in the valley of Mexico. Going south from Mexico City, one climbs this valley wall, the Sierra of Ajusco, at an elevation of nine thousand feet above the sea. Standing upon the southern edge of the escarpment one stands also on the threshold of Morelos. There the rampart drops suddenly away into warm green valleys that go on and down one beyond the other in a maze of slighter mountains that from this eminence are no more than hills.

In each shelf or pocket of the mountains lies a vil- 131
lage, or a cluster of villages. Close underneath the 133
row of peaks[1] which forms the last bulwark of the 361
escarpment is situated Tepoztlán. This village is the

[1] This *sierra*, the southwestern margin of the *cordillera* of Ajusco, extends southeastward to the *pueblo* of Tlayacapan, Morelos. It is composed of basaltic tufa and fine volcanic ash.

[135]

1:Redfield E-5 (1926-1927)1930
NU37 Tepoztlan NU37

171 from Yautepec at a considerable distance because he
[291] wears his trousers shorter and tighter and because he is likely to wear a handkerchief at his neck. It is also
[197] probable that there are dialectic differences[1] which distinguish Yautepec from Tepoztlán. Of differences
184 between hamlets within the community there are probably many. In Santa Catarina beans are first
[252] toasted and then boiled with much *epazote*,[2] whereas in Tepoztlán that staple is not toasted and the boiling is usually without *epazote*. No statistical proof can be
[582] offered here of the statement, which in Tepoztlán is
[829] generally accepted as representing the fact, that in San Andres marriage takes place, "according to ancient custom," generally at the age of twelve to sixteen, whereas in Tepoztlán the ages are most commonly from eighteen to twenty-four.

628 In spite of local differences, the eight villages are
184 bound together by certain institutions in which each
182 village has a share. Chief of these institutions are the common lands, the market, and the traditional festal and ceremonial organization. The bi-weekly interchange of goods and gossip at the market has already been briefly described. The other two principal integrating factors require more comment.

423 The common lands[3] of the community constitute
182

[1] Differences in Spanish spoken. Little Nahuatl is spoken at Yautepec, which, although a pre-Columbian site, is now largely a *mestizo* community.

[2] *Chenopodium ambrosioides* L. This statement rests on the account of one informant.

[3] The general subject of "The Land Systems of Mexico" is admirably treated in G. M. McBride's book of that title, previously cited.

1:Redfield E-5 (1926-1927) 1930
NU37 Tepoztlan NU37

probably the strongest single factor operating to draw the eight villages together. The lands were thus influential in pre-Columbian times when all real property was held in common, usually not by the *pueblo* but by the subdivision of the *pueblo*, the *calpolli*.[1] Since the Reforma (1857) communal holdings have been generally reduced to individual tenure. This was probably early accomplished in Tepoztlán; private agricultural tracts are there the subject of entirely individual ownership and sale. Nevertheless the private lands are encircled by public lands in which all inhabitants of the eight villages share and which, with the *milpas*, constitute the local "fatherland."

There are thus both private and public lands in Tepoztlán. The private lands include:

1. *House sites (sitios) with their attendant agricultural plots (milpas).*—Characteristically each *sitio* has an appendant *milpa*, which may be located as much as a mile away from the *sitio;* but the two are usually taxed, and inherited together. These tracts are not infrequently sold, but most of them have been in the same family for many generations. Most of the produce supporting the community is raised on the *milpas*. There should also be mentioned the *corrales*, yards at the back of dwellings sometimes planted with corn or beans.

2. *Milpas de labor.*—These are agricultural lands reduced to private possession and tillage out of the

[1] The *calpolli* was perhaps originally a kinship unit; its limited survival in Tepoztlán will be discussed in a subsequent chapter.

l:Redfield E-5 (1926-1927)1930
NU37 Tepoztlan NU37

423 311 241 public lands, whether *cerriles* or *pastales*. Anyone (first obtaining permission from the municipal authorities) may till such an unoccupied piece. The inhabitants of the seven hamlets and of Tepoztlán stand on equal footing with regard to this privilege. Once the tract is reduced to possession trespass or theft is punished. The right to cultivate tracts such as these is probably sometimes sold, but no permanent title ever vests, because if the occupant fails to cultivate his tract, the municipality may reassign the tract. It is, therefore, perhaps strictly incorrect to include these lands among private holdings. But the cultivator speaks of the land as his, and, as has been said, he may even sell what right he has.

3. *Tlacololli*.—What has been said with regard to the *milpas de labor* as to tenure and cultivation applies equally to *tlacololli*. They differ only in that the former often embrace considerable areas, and are like separate farms (*ranchitas*), and they may be cultivated year after year; while the latter are small tracts of cleared land on steep mountain sides (they are taken out of the public *cerriles*). As the soil, once cleared, quickly washes away, they may be tilled no more than one or a few seasons.[1]

423 311 The public lands are those wide tracts of land unsuitable for agriculture which surround the private *milpas*. They are of two sorts: pasture lands on arid slopes (*pastales*) and wooded mountain sides (*cerriles*). They represent, historically, that part of the com-

[1] "I will open for you a *tlaculol*," sings the lover to his lady in a local ballad.

1:Redfield E-5 (1926-1927) 1930
NU37 Tepoztlan NU37

munal lands of the Indian *pueblo*, the *altepetlalli*, which has not been converted to private holdings, and they equally represent the communal pastures and wood lots of the medieval Spanish village.[1] Together, *pastales* and *cerriles* constitute the *ejido* of the present *pueblo*. Anyone from Tepoztlán or the seven hamlets may pasture cattle or cut wood in these lands.[2] These common lands are a source of frequent discussion and dispute; regulations are made for their protection and administration and often they are the subject of quarrels with neighboring landholding units. For many years Tepoztlán (the entire municipality) has disputed with the *hacienda* of Oacalco the ownership to certain marginal lands, and the fact that the *hacienda* is now not in private hands but in the hands of the state has not abated the quarrel.

Such a dispute, of the entire valley community with another landholding organization, serves to enhance the local *esprit de corps*. But it must be said that land disputes may operate to set one village against another as well as to draw them all together. It is probable that not infrequently one village comes to claim a special right in some particular part of the *ejido*. In 1927 a dispute developed with regard to certain mountain lands in which the inhabitants of Santa Catarina were cutting wood for charcoal without first

[1] McBride, *Land Systems of Mexico*, p. 114.

[2] These public lands, it will be observed, are exploited by individuals for private profit. The only lands in Tepoztlán which are both communally owned and communally operated for communal profit are the lands belonging to the local chapels; these will be explained in a later chapter.

1:Redfield E-5 (1926-1927)1930
NU37 Tepoztlan NU37

423 628 578 [648] obtaining the permission of the municipal authorities in Tepoztlán. The land had once belonged to another neighboring *hacienda* and had been the subject of another prolonged dispute in the course of which lives were taken, but for some time now the *hacienda* has been a ruin and a memory. Tepoztlán claims to have purchased the land, through the form of a conveyance to a group of citizens, while Santa Catarina denies this sale and claims to have made a contract with the *hacienda* granting permission to cut wood on the property. When the local government arrested the *carboneros* of Santa Catarina, that hamlet asserted its alleged special rights with vigor, and a considerable bitterness developed between the people of Tepoztlán and those of Santa Catarina.

621 628 796 [182] The eight villages are in this manner bound into a community by common interests which stimulate now co-operation, now competition. The same alternation of opposing tendencies—one centripetal, one centrifugal—can be observed in connection with the institutions which carry on the social and ceremonial activities. Each village is under the protection of the local saint whose image is housed in the single church of the village. On the name day of the saint the village holds a *fiesta* celebrating this patron god. These occasions require a great deal of preparation involving food for the festal dishes, decoration of the church, fireworks, religious dances, etc. The village is then the focus of attention for the people of the community; and to the *fiesta* come also many from outside the

l:Redfield E-5 (1926-1927) 1930
NU37 Tepoztlan NU37

of two purposes: the candles burned before the *santo* on the day of the *fiesta*, and the tower of fireworks (*castillo*) burned in the atrium of the church on that occasion. The payment for each of these purposes, of the year's instalment of the perpetual pledge, is an occasion attended by solemnizing ritual, both acted and spoken. The ceremonies take place at the houses of the *mayordomos* of the candles and of the *castillo*, and the occasions are known respectively as the *cerahpa* and the *castiyohpa*.[1]

As has already been indicated in a previous chapter, the *ejidos* of Tepoztlán are not, as were the *altepetlalli* of the pre-Columbian town, divided into sections among the *barrios*. The pastures and wood lots belonging to the town are used in common by all the *pueblo* (and by the seven smaller villages) without regard to *barrio* membership. The private agricultural fields are not grouped according to *barrios*. A resident of San Miguel may own a *milpa* over near Santa Cruz at the other side of town, although as a matter of fact *milpas* are, naturally, more often than not situated near the owner's dwelling.

But each *barrio* owns lands the produce of which goes to the support of the chapel of the *barrio*. Or, as the Tepoztecans would put it, the produce goes to the support of the *santo*. The lands are referred to as *imimil to santo*, "the *milpas* of our *santo*." These are the only truly communal lands of Tepoztlán. Conform-

[1] This ritual is briefly described on p. 100, and more fully in Redfield, art., "The Cerahpa and the Castiyohpa in Tepoztlan."

1:Redfield E-5 (1926-1927)1930
NU37 Tepoztlan NU37

able with law, the legal title to these lands is held by an individual, but he holds in trust for the *santo*. His interest in the land is no greater than that of any other member of the *barrio*. The lands are sowed, tended, and harvested in common by the men of the *barrio*, under the direction of the *mayordomo* of the *santo*, and the crop, when sold, goes to the upkeep of the chapel—for candles, curtains for the altars, etc. Most of the lands so communally owned by the *barrios* are *milpas* on which maize is grown. But San Miguel also owns a grove of *chirimoyas*, and San Pedro owns a grove of cedars. (Cedar boughs, now as in pre-Columbian times, are much used in decorating altars and are subject to other religious and magical uses.) In addition, certain of the *barrios*, notably San Miguel, own bulls which are used for *toros*, a sort of rustic bullfight sometimes held on the occasion of the *fiesta* of the *santo*. During the rest of the year the bulls are loaned out to members of the *barrio* for upkeep.[1]

The *barrio* is plainly recognizable as the pre-Columbian *calpolli*. From the accounts[2] we have of the social organization of Tenochtitlan (Mexico City) and of Texcoco, it appears that each *pueblo* in the Nahua area was divided into units which bore this name. These units were originally, it has been supposed,[3]

[1] The communal ownership of these bulls is not fully attested. During the year of the writer's stay San Miguel lent its bulls to Los Reyes at the time of the *fiesta* of the latter *barrio;* Los Reyes had none of its own, or too few.

[2] See T. T. Waterman, *Bandelier's Contribution to the Study of Ancient Mexican Social Organization.*

[3] *Ibid.* Spinden, *Ancient Civilizations of Mexico and Central America*, p. 190, contra.

1:Redfield E-5 (1926-1927) 1930
NU37 Tepoztlan NU37

CHAPTER VIII

THE DIVISION OF LABOR

Not only does Tepoztlán maintain itself almost entirely by farming, but nearly every Tepoztecan is a farmer. Most families have at least a small *milpa* in which the men are active during the seasons of sowing and of harvesting. Only the teacher, perhaps, and a few of the artisans and merchants have so specialized their functions as to remain no longer at least in part agriculturalists. Although most of the rural population of Mexico was, until recent agrarian reforms, landless, most of the people of Tepoztlán have for a very long time tilled their own fields.

As with many other communities of peasants or of primitive peoples, therefore, specialization of function has not proceeded so far but that nearly everyone practices the fundamental techniques of maintenance. Agriculture remains as a sort of occupational common denominator. During the harvest season the carpenters leave their benches; some of the merchants close their shops; even the messenger who goes to the railroad for the mail[1] delegates his duties to a boy while he gathers his own harvest, or assists in bringing in the harvest of neighbors.

[1] Daily mail delivery (by carrier) to Tepoztlán was inaugurated in September, 1926. Before that, letters for Tepoztlán were held at El Parque, the nearest railway station.

2:Lewis E-5 (1943-1948)1951 NU37 Tepoztlan NU37

culturation, we found that there was a greater willingness among the better-to-do and more acculturated families on our list to have one of our staff live with them. Some of the poorer families who expressed willingness to accept a student were unable to do so because of very crowded living conditions. Many of these poorer families were large and lived in a single room.

We were now ready to begin the accumulation of a great variety of information on every family in the village. Each assistant was made responsible for gathering the data in his barrio. In the three smaller barrios, none of which had over forty families, it was possible to get a few informants who knew quite intimately most families in their barrios. In these smaller barrios, for instance, practically any male adult knew quite well who did or did not own land or other property. In the larger barrios no single informant was well acquainted with more than a small percentage of the families, and we therefore had to use many more informants. In effect, we were doing a census in each barrio, with the number of items investigated progressively increasing as our rapport improved, and as we felt free to ask more questions. Among the items of information which we eventually obtained for each family were (1) ownership of property, such as house, land, cattle and other animals, fruit trees, and sewing machines; (2) occupation and sources of income; (3) marital status, number of marriages, barrio of origin or birthplace of each spouse, kinship of all persons then living on the same house site, and other related items; (4) social participation and positions of leadership; (5) educational level and whether or not any of the children had attended school outside the village. These items were obtained on all families and were supplemented by a number of partial surveys on other items. In addition to the information which we obtained ourselves, we also utilized and checked much of the information contained in the census of 1940. We had obtained a special breakdown of the municipio census by individual villages from the Federal Department of Statistics. The information on all these items was checked independently by at least two informants.

Getting accurate data on land-ownership in Tepoztlán was a difficult and delicate matter because of general suspicion of the motives of anyone who undertakes such a study. Our staff worked for many weeks copying the property listing in the local property register for every family in the village. These findings were then compared with the information independently obtained from informants. Many discrepancies were found. The information which we obtained from informants indicated that approximately fifteen of the people who owned land according to our informants were not registered as landowners. On the other hand, we found several cases of land registered in the name of individuals who were not known by our informants to be landowners. By checking all cases in which there was a discrepancy between the data in the register and those of our informants, we believe that we arrived at a reasonably accurate picture of the real situation. In this connection we learned that there was a higher incidence of unregistered land in the outlying villages of the municipio, where such matters are less easily controlled by local authorities.

The question of the size of land plots presented much more difficult problems than the question of land-ownership. Tepoztecans still do not think basically in

2:Lewis E-5 (1943-1948) 1951 NU37 Tepoztlan NU37

terms of hectares, but rather in terms of the amount of seed needed to plant a plot. Thus a peasant will say he planted so many *cuartillos* of corn or beans, rather than so many hectares or *tareas*. In Tepoztlán the number of *cuartillos* of corn that will cover one hectare varies according to the size of seed and the type of terrain. By and large, however, Tepoztecans consider that ten *cuartillos* of *maíz ancho*, the prevalent type of corn used, make up one hectare in lands used for plow agriculture, which are the only privately owned lands and the only ones we were concerned with. We measured and paced numerous milpas with the aid of the two Mexican agronomists, and found that the quantity of seed for one hectare of land varied between nine and one-half to twelve *cuartillos* of corn. On this basis we accepted the Tepoztecan figure of ten *cuartillos* as reasonably accurate and have used it throughout the study. In checking sample plots for size, we found that the size of plots registered was quite accurate. However, the value of land registered had no relationship to its current value.

With the help of the agronomists, we mapped all the village sites as well as some of the outlying agricultural lands near some of the barrios. On my later visits to the village in 1947 and 1948, I did a study of land types and land use with the assistance of Alberto Beltrán, who drew the maps and aided in surveys. We also carefully examined the municipal records, from which we obtained data on births and deaths over a ten-year period, the number of marriages over an eight-year period, the municipal income and expenditures for a fifteen-year period, and the number and types of court cases from 1926 to 1944.

We would like to say a word about our use of Tepoztecans as assistants. We took advantage of the presence of a number of intelligent and fairly well-educated Tepoztecans in the village by employing them as assistants in many of the surveys. This saved us a great deal of time and effort, and we were able to collect a wider variety of data than would otherwise have been possible. In addition to surveys, we obtained autobiographies, written accounts of experiences during the Revolution, a daily record over a short period of all visitors to the Municipal Palace and the purpose of the visits, written accounts of the local political situation by various political figures in the village, collections of stories, jokes, and sayings, and case histories of quarrels among neighbors and among relatives. We were gratified that several of our Tepoztecan assistants proved to be such helpful and reliable workers.

While we were gathering this information for the village as a whole, each of our student assistants was recording data and observations on the families with which they were living. A long, detailed guide for observing and recording behavioral data and for the writing of life histories was prepared by Ruth Lewis as an aid to the students. Again, we secured the cooperation of the more educated members of families in keeping daily records, in answering special questionnaires, or in writing up special subjects.

The testing program was carried out in the school, and the testing group was made up of fifty children of school age selected from our list of twenty-one representative families. The families represented each of the socio-economic levels and each of the barrios. The psychological tests which we endeavored to give to each child in the testing group were the Rorschach, the Grace-Arthur Performance Scale,

2:Lewis E-5 (1943-1948) 1951 NU37 Tepoztlan NU37

and had an interview with Emperor Maximilian at Acapantzingo to impress upon him the need for such education in Mexico. In 1878 Rojas was appointed secretary of the Department of Public Education of the state of Morelos by Francisco Leyva, the first constitutional governor of the state. Later Rojas returned to the village and published a newspaper in Náhuatl called "Xocoyotzin" (*El Menor*), and also a paper in Náhuatl and Spanish called *El Grano de Arena*. In the eighties he organized a chapter of the Lancaster Society, an educational society which had been making inroads in Mexico at the time. Rojas also had many personal contacts with President Porfirio Díaz, and in 1908 was appointed professor of Náhuatl at the National Museum of Archaeology.

Shortly before the Revolution, a small Museum of Antiquities was founded in Tepoztlán, a public library was opened, and night classes for adult education were held. This cultural florescence, though short-lived and limited to a small group of Tepoztecan intellectuals, most of whom came from well-to-do *cacique* families, earned for Tepoztlán the reputation of being the Athens of Morelos. This group of intellectuals had considerable influence despite their small number, and were instrumental in sending many young Tepoztecans to schools outside and in setting a precedent for higher education which has inspired Tepoztecans to this day.

A landmark in the history of the development of Tepoztlán was the building of the railroad in 1897 through the upper part of the municipio, with a station at El Parque—which is about an hour's climb from the village of Tepoztlán. The building of the railroad was opposed by most Tepoztecans, and set off a sharp struggle between the local *caciques* and the population at large who accused the former of selling out the communal resources to the gringos. Despite this opposition, Tepoztecans participated in the benefits which came with the building of the railroad. Many of them worked as day laborers and received the then phenomenal wage of $1.50 a day, or well over three times the prevailing wages at haciendas. In addition there were hundreds of laborers from other villages, many of whom came down to Tepoztlán to buy supplies.

Trade flourished, and it is said that there were more stores and artisans in the village at that time than in the years between 1920 and 1930. This source of income, though temporary and favoring primarily the merchants, was one of the factors which contributed to the cultural florescence which was going on during this time. Tepoztecans came into contact with laborers from all over Mexico and with Americans. The first wire fencing and steel plows came into the village with the railroad, and the advent of freight trains stimulated the charcoal-making industry.

Tepoztlán is typical of another major current in Mexican history, the relationship and the struggles between the so-called free Indian villages and the haciendas. Because of the marginal location of Tepoztlán to the hacienda area, and because most of its lands were unsuitable for sugar and rice plantations, Tepoztlán managed to escape the aggrandizement of the haciendas, except for a portion of its southern lands which were lost to the Hacienda of Oacalco. But while Tepoztlán was able to retain most of its communal lands since the Conquest, it was close enough to the haciendas to serve as a convenient source of labor supply, and its economy was therefore intimately tied up with that of the hacienda system.

2;Lewis E-5 (1943-1948)1951 NU37 Tepoztlan NU37

The Mexican Revolution of 1910-20 was a turning point in the history of Tepoztlán as well as of the nation, and was a major influence in breaking down any remaining isolation of the village. Tepoztlán was in the heart of Zapatista country, and few villages suffered greater upheavals. The village was alternately occupied by opposing Zapatista and federal forces recruited from all parts of the country, and both left their progeny in the village, further adding to the mixture of physical types. At one time or another during this period the entire population fled to the hills or to Mexico City, Guerrero, Puebla, and other parts of the country, and as a result there is a large proportion of adults who have lived outside of Tepoztlán.

The Revolution also brought about the overthrow of the ruling *cacique* group in Tepoztlán and a general lessening of social and economic class differences. The communal lands which had been under the control of local *caciques* were now freely available to all Tepoztecans. Furthermore, the municipio regained the land it had lost to a neighboring hacienda and thus participated in the benefits of the national *ejido* program. In addition, the Revolution has meant a general rise in the standard of living, the expansion of educational facilities, as well as a weakening of the older concepts of authoritarianism and a corresponding strengthening of democratic values.

Tepoztlán mirrors many national trends and brings into sharp focus some of the most pressing problems of Mexico as a nation. The changes which have occurred in Tepoztlán since the Revolution, such as the introduction of corn mills, the building of modern highways, and the establishment of bus service to Cuernavaca, are typical of changes that are taking place over wide areas throughout Mexico. The poor agricultural resources, the relative importance of forest and grazing lands in the agricultural economy, soil erosion and exhaustion, deforestation, the small size of both private and *ejido* landholdings, population pressure, and low productivity are among the problems which stand out in Tepoztlán as in the nation. One of the advantages of studying these problems within the framework of a single municipio and village is that we can better understand the inter-relationship between geographic, historic, economic, social, political, and psychological factors; and above all, it is possible to know better what these problems and changes mean to the people themselves.

It is important, also, to consider the ways in which Tepoztlán is distinctive. If we compare Tepoztlán with other villages in Mexico, rather than with the nation as a whole, we find that in many ways it is atypical. Tepoztlán is a large village, larger than ninety per cent of the villages of Mexico, making for a greater complexity of social organization. Tepoztlán has been a political and administrative center of the municipio since the Conquest and even under Moctezuma; it has retained its communal lands,[29] a long tradition of literacy, and a local intelligentsia

[29] Simpson, in connection with an otherwise excellent critique of Chase's romantic version of Tepoztlán, has written that Tepoztlán cannot be considered a "typical" Mexican village or municipio because, according to Helen Phipps (*Some Aspects of the Agrarian Question in Mexico —A Historical Study* (Austin: University of Texas Press, 1925), p. 120) it was the only village in the entire state of Morelos which maintained its communal lands. It seems to me that Phipps' statement is a considerable exaggeration. At least three of the municipios surrounding Tepoztlán did not lose all of their communal lands before the Revolution; their lands, like those

2;Lewis E-5 (1943-1948)1951 NU37 Tepoztlan NU37

[648] in which the national administrative apparatus affects the daily lives of Tepoztecans will be considered here.

TAXATION

[651] Federal taxation touches most Tepoztecans directly and is a common subject of complaint. Most Tepoztecans view it as an imposition and do not readily understand the need for taxation nor what is done with the money. In fact, Tepoztecans pay relatively little in federal taxes, primarily on the sale of charcoal, on the slaughter of animals, and on trade. Tepoztecans accept fatalistically the necessity of paying taxes, but it develops a negative and critical attitude toward the national government.

HEALTH SERVICES

[744] [757] The federal government has a health center in Cuernavaca which is frequented by some Tepoztecans. However, the majority, particularly the older people, do not use it because they still prefer *curanderos* and are not yet accustomed to the idea of receiving services from the state. Even the federal health workers who come into the village from time to time to administer inoculations against communicable disease are endured by most villagers out of "respect" for the great power of the government, rather than because of an understanding of their services.

AGRICULTURAL SERVICES

[656] The Departamento Agrario intervenes directly in the affairs of Tepoztecans who hold land under the *ejido* program. Federal authority is the final authority which resolves problems or conflicts concerning *ejido* lands. But here, too, many Tepoztecans see in the agrarian authorities an imposition rather than a system of public service. As we have shown earlier, the nationalization of the communal lands has lessened local control, and this has not been well accepted. Tepoztecans [423] do not yet understand the need for national control of forest resources, especially when such control conflicts with their local interests.

NATIONAL DEFENSE

Perhaps the clearest form in which the Tepoztecan peasant sees the power of the federal government is in the federal troops. Almost as a matter of tradition, [702] Tepoztecans have viewed soldiers with strong suspicion and dislike, and have fought attempts to conscript their sons. However, the attitude toward federal troops today is quite different from that shown toward the Federales of the Díaz [701] regime. Today the troops stationed in the village fraternize with the population; and though they are "respected" there is less of the fear that existed during the Díaz regime. Federal troops have been sent to the village on a number of occasions in recent years, once in connection with resistance to conscription during [702] the early part of World War II, and again when local political contests resulted in [666] violence.

2:Lewis E-5 (1943-1948) 1951 NU37 Tepoztlan NU37

tury seemed to have little effect on Tepoztecan internal structure. The political life of the village continued in the hands of families who represented a mixture of the old *principales* and the new Spanish elite.

During the Díaz regime the domination of the village by the upper *cacique* group reached its peak, and class distinctions were marked. The *caciques* owned most of the privately held land, controlled the communal lands of the municipio and the local government, and formed an elite group who had social contacts with the elite of Cuernavaca and even of Mexico City. They were set apart from the rest of the village population by their large and more elaborate homes located in the center of the village, their urban styled clothing, their literacy and superior education. Vicente Ortega, the *cacique* in power almost until the outbreak of the Revolution, was a *compadre* of the governor of the state of Morelos, and served as a representative to the state legislature; and other leading Tepoztecans achieved high positions in the state administrative hierarchy.

The Revolution transformed the social structure of the village. The upper or *cacique* families fled the village for their lives and lost most of their wealth, particularly their cattle and artisan shops. The poor who remained also had to leave the village repeatedly, and sought refuge in the surrounding *cerros* when government troops were approaching. Once peace was restored, the families slowly began to return to the village. Some of the *caciques* or their sons also returned to take up residence in their battered or burned homes. It was necessary for all, rich and poor, to begin life anew and build back to normalcy. But they were building within a new social framework. The participation of the villagers in the ranks of the Zapatista forces, the revolutionary slogans of "land and liberty" and "down with the *caciques*" had left its imprint on the psychology of the people and acted as a distinct levelling influence. The political dominance of the *caciques* was gone. And a fundamental economic change had occurred, for the communal lands of the municipio, which constituted about eighty per cent of all the lands, were again available to the villagers. By 1930 the village had also recovered its *ejido* from one of the nearby haciendas, further broadening the land base in the village.

FACTORS IN STATUS

Today, class distinctions in Tepoztlán are much less marked; the former economic and social bases for class distinctions are gone.[5] But there are numerous status distinctions in the village, and the possibility of some future development of sharper stratification on the basis of wealth can be seen. It might be more accurate to describe present-day Tepoztlán as an incipient class society.[6] Sex, age, and kinship

[5] Memory of former class distinctions remains and exerts some influence. The expression, "He is the son of a *cacique* family," was used repeatedly by our informants.

[6] The term "class" is used here in the traditional sense to distinguish between broad social groupings differentiated from other groupings by their relationship to the process of production, by occupational distinctions, income levels, and a sense of social distance that makes for cohesive social groups over a period of time. In this definition I follow MacIver who writes, "It is the sense of status, sustained by economic, political, or ecclesiastical power and by the distinc-

2:Lewis E-5 (1943-1948)1951 NU37 Tepoztlan NU37

563 to dress in the white *calzones* and huaraches like most Tepoztecans, may be called
[196] "un indio platudo," a wealthy Indian, or literally "a silvered Indian." Thus, the
[554] residents of Gabriel Mariaca are often described as "esos inditos tienen harta lana, son platudos."

The term *negro* or *negra* is sometimes used as a term of abuse. An irate husband
[195] may call his wife *negra* or *cumbuca* if she is a shade darker than he. But similarly,
[578] he may call her *gringa*, if she is somewhat lighter; both terms are intended as insults.
[565] Many of the sons and daughters of the old *cacique* families seem to be lighter than the rest of the population, suggesting that the *caciques* of the Díaz epoch may have had a stronger admixture of Spanish blood than did the rest of the population. However, groupings do not run along racial lines. About an equal sprinkling of light-skinned people is found among the rich and poor, the *cultos*, the *ignorantes*, etc.

WEALTH

556 The concepts of rich and poor are frequently used designations of social status in Tepoztlán. But the terms are used in a relative way, are not easily defined, and are applied, as a rule, to individuals rather than to groups. All Tepoztecans tend to characterize themselves as poor, and there is no ostentatious display of wealth on the part of the rich. Concealing wealth is a deep-seated trait, done to avoid envy, claims of friends, taxes, and contributions to the church and public affairs. This attitude tends to limit the function of wealth as a factor for social differentiation. And, by and large, the rich in Tepoztlán are not easily distinguishable from the poor.

Both rich and poor work the land dressed in the same white *calzones* and huaraches; both rich and poor hire day laborers when necessary; and men who own
[464] property, as well as those who do not, hire themselves out as laborers when cash is needed. Many of the present-day rich families were once poor, and they cling to the habits of hard work and frugality with which they improved their economic status. However, in varying degrees the rich have a higher standard of living than the poor and can be said to eat better, dress better, and live in more comfortable and better equipped homes. But a man's wealth is not judged by the way in which he lives; rather it is estimated in the amount of land, cattle, plow-oxen, and money he has.

In general there is no sharp social distance between the rich and poor, although there is much sensitivity and awareness of differences in economic status. People in Tepoztlán prefer the company of their equals or inferiors, rather than those who are in a superior economic status. But although a rich man may explain the poverty of a neighbor in terms of his being backward and ignorant, he will treat him with due respect.

LAND-OWNERSHIP

● 423 The expression, "He has many lands" (land parcels) is the simplest way the
556 Tepoztecan has of designating wealth and high social status. Conversely, when one

2;Lewis E-5 (1943-1948) 1951 NU37 Tepoztlan NU37

says, "He has no land" it is the equivalent of stating that a man is poor. But the contrast between landless and landholders from a purely economic point of view is not sharp, because most landholders have tiny holdings and do not live any better than many who are landless.[4] Yet, even the ownership of a small parcel adds to a man's social standing because of the positive value associated with land-ownership. The acquisition of even a small parcel of land gives the Tepoztecan a feeling of well being and security. It should be noted that the landholders and the landless do not constitute distinct social classes, and there is no conflict of ideologies between them.

Within the category of landholders a distinction is made between (1) *propietarios*, those who own private land; (2) *ejidatarios*, those who hold *ejido* parcels; and (3) *tlacololeros*, those who work communal lands. The economic aspects of these three distinct tenurial types will be treated later.[5] Here it should be noted that, in a sense, each represents a distinct status group, with the greatest prestige attached to *propietarios* and the least to the *tlacololeros*. In addition, each group has different and sometimes conflicting interests, and as such is developing distinctive group consciousness.

The *tlacololeros*, for example, organized themselves during the thirties and have taken the leadership in defending the communal lands in boundary disputes with other municipios, because these are the lands upon which they depend. The *tlacololeros* as a group have been opposed to the nationalization of the communal lands of the municipio and the creation of a municipal *ejido*. They view the transfer of *tlacolol* land to *ejidatarios* as a threat to their interests. Thus, the *tlacololeros* are the staunchest defenders of the ancient Indian system of communal land-ownership.

The *ejidatarios*, on the other hand, do not share the collectivist tendencies of the *tlacololeros*. On the contrary, they seem motivated by a strong sense of individualism and would like to become private owners of the *ejido* parcels assigned them. The *ejidatarios* are perhaps the most politically conscious group in the village, for their welfare depends in large measure on political considerations, and particularly on maintaining cordial relations with the *ejido* commissioner.

LABOR RELATIONS

Most landowners in Tepoztlán have occasion to be both employers and employees during the year. As employers they hire *peones* to help with the planting and harvesting, and as employees they hire themselves out to other landowners or artisans when work on their own land is over. This double role is a common one and blurs whatever class lines there are in Tepoztlán. Even those who are *peones* the whole year round hope some day to be landowners and employers. Also, employees are frequently relatives, *compadres*, or friends with whom there is a reciprocal arrangement of aid or labor exchange. There are no men who employ many workers on a large scale; three or four *peones* who are hired for short periods

[4] The contrast between landholder and landless was much sharper before the Revolution.
[5] See Chapter 6, "Land Tenure," p. 113.

2:Lewis E-5 (1943-1948) 1951 NU37 Tepoztlan NU37

of the remaining ten consists of comb, shears, and scissors, and the barber usually performs in his yard under a *ciruela* tree. Barbering is still an occasional occupation. Even in the center shops there are no fixed hours, and they are normally open only on Sundays and Wednesdays.

Of the fourteen corn merchants in the village, four buy corn on a large scale; the

Fig. 18. Meat display in the market.

others buy up small quantities which they take to Cuernavaca twice a week. Two factors have been responsible for the increase in corn merchants. Most important was the expansion of the land base by the *ejido* grants and the privilege of using the communal *ilacalol* lands. Twenty years ago there was a greater relative number of landless *peones* than today, and the village had to import large quantities of corn for its own consumption. Today the village sells about 1,000 *cargas* of corn out of a total production of about 14,000 *cargas*.[1] The new needs of the people, the higher standard of living, and the sharp rise in prices in the last few years, demand a larger amount of ready cash than formerly and force many families to sell their corn.

Referring again to Table 19, we see that there has also been an increase in the number of *curanderos*, *chirimiteros*, and fireworks makers. These are the specialists which Redfield characterized as the *tontos* in contrast to the *correctos*, who were the storekeepers, merchants, etc. Today no such distinction exists in the village.

[1] One *carga* is about 213 pounds.

2:Lewis E-5 (1943-1948) 1951 NU37 Tepoztlan NU37

land tenure: 6

Three types of land tenure are found in Tepoztlán: communal land holdings, *ejido* holdings, and private holdings. Communal lands comprise approximately eighty per cent of the land of the municipio and include four of the five land types, *zacatal*, *monte*, *cerros*, and *terrenos cerriles*. These lands have belonged traditionally to the municipio and have been under its control. Any member of the municipio enjoys the right to use these lands, and they are not divided into plots.

Ejido lands constitute somewhat less than five per cent of the land within the municipio and consist primarily of arable land for plow agriculture. *Ejido* lands are communally owned by the municipio but are under the control of locally elected *ejido* authorities, rather than the regular municipal authorities. *Ejido* holdings differ from other communal holdings in that they are divided into small plots and assigned to individuals in accord with the rules of eligibility established by the National Ejido Program. *Ejido* and private holdings are practically identical, except that the former cannot be sold. However, *ejido* plots may remain in the same family for many years and may be passed down from father to sons if the need for the land can be satisfactorily proved. Private holdings consist mostly of the land used for plow agriculture and constitute about sixteen per cent of all the land in the municipio. Private holdings are held in *fee simple*, and ownership must be proved by legal title.

It is important to remember that in Tepoztlán all three types of landholdings are worked individually rather than collectively. The only exception relates to the working of church lands. Here we find a curious combination of what is technically private ownership with a collective form of labor. Each of the seven barrios "owns" a plot of land which is worked collectively by the members of the barrio for the support of the barrio chapel. The land, however, is registered in the name of a trusted barrio member because of the law against the church ownership of land. This type of collective working of land is an old pattern. Before the Revolution of 1857 each of the twenty saints in the large central church of the village had its plot of land which its particular devotees worked collectively. The similarity between this system and that of the pre-Conquest days is noteworthy, and it is possible that

2;Lewis E-5 (1943-1948)1951 NU37 Tepoztlan NU37

the same lands which were worked for the Aztec priesthood were later worked for the Catholic Church.

COMMUNAL LANDS

The communal lands represent one of the oldest forms of landholding and have shown a remarkable stability through the years. The system of communal landholding has remained practically intact through both the Aztec and Spanish Conquests. Indeed, the similarity between the policy of the Spanish and Aztec conquerors of Tepoztlán toward the system of communal landholdings is noteworthy.

When Tepoztecans asked the Spaniards for legal title to their lands in the early sixteenth century, they were able to present maps showing the boundaries of their lands which they had held under Moctezuma. These ancient "titles" were used by the Spaniards as a basis for determining the limits of the land grants.[1] The present limits of the municipio are therefore almost identical with those of pre-Hispanic days. Because most Tepoztecan lands were ill suited for either sugar or rice plantations, and because of the policy both of the Crown and of the Marqués del Valle, who conquered Tepoztlán in 1521, to alter only those native institutions which constituted a direct threat to the conquerors, the Marqués was not interested in Tepoztecan lands as such. Rather, he wanted taxes in the form of produce and later in money, and he wanted the labor of Tepoztecans to work his mines and haciendas.

Tepoztlán received its first land titles from the Viceroy Don Antonio de Mendoza in a grant dated May 20, 1548. This grant consisted of two *sitios de ganado mayor;* its next grant under Don Luis de Velasco, dated February 6, 1595, was for four *sitios de ganado menor* and eight *caballerías de tierra.*[2] These land grants gave Tepoztecans legal title to lands which they had traditionally worked and claimed.

The titles for the communal holdings of the municipio are considered very precious, and responsibility for their safekeeping is entrusted to the *tlandco* of the municipal local government in Tepoztlán. These titles are used primarily in boundary disputes, which have been going on with neighboring municipios for the past four hundred years. From historical documents we learn that less than one hundred years after the Conquest the land titles had already been lost. The loss and recovery of the land titles has occurred again and again in the history of the municipio.

According to local tradition, the titles to the municipal lands fell into the hands of the Hacienda de San Gaspar during the middle of the last century. Tepoztecans were prohibited from using their own forest resources, which the hacienda used for wood fuel. The Tepoztecans carried on an extended feud with this hacienda, and the agents were killed on sight in the village. Apparently the hacienda was

[1] In these early land grants, the land was described as follows ". . . la mayor parte de tierra infructífera por los muchos cerros y lomas ásperas, barrancas y montes intransitables." These early documents also establish the fact that the village of Tepoztlán was the administrative seat of the municipio. The surrounding villages are listed as *pagos.* See *Ramo de Tierras,* Vol. 67 (1591), Exp. 11, Foja 12; and Vol. 3501 (1745), Exp. 1, Cuaderno 4. The ancient boundaries are also given in the *Relación.*

[2] *Ibid.*

2:Lewis E-5 (1943-1948) 1951 NU37 Tepoztlan NU37

agreeable to settling the issue and offered to sell the land titles back to Tepoztlán. A wealthy Tepoztecan, Vicente Gómez, offered to lend the money to the municipio for the purchase of the titles. This man later became a leading *cacique* in the village and controlled the local government. In an attempt to recover his loan, he levied heavy taxes on each sack of charcoal produced by Tepoztecans. A group of villagers finally assassinated him.

The land titles were again lost between 1900 and 1905 when a local priest sold to an outsider the land titles and other important documents kept in the archives of the convent.[8] A few years later the village had to buy them back at a high price. This occurred again in 1925 when the municipio paid 800 pesos to buy back its land titles from a non-Tepoztecan woman into whose hands they had fallen.

Judging from the early documents, there was little change in the system of communal landholdings during the entire colonial period. The only references of significance show that as early as 1567 Cortés had rented some Tepoztecan lands to the operator of his Hacienda of Tlahuenango and also to some Tepoztecans. Presumably Cortés was using communal lands for this purpose. The first great change in the system of landholdings occurred after the Revolution of 1857 when most of the communal lands held by the church were taken over by some of the leading families of the village as private property. After this time Tepoztecans could petition the local authorities for title to some of the communal lands.

One occasion for a fairly large distribution of communal lands to individual Tepoztecans occurred in the late 1890's as a result of an attempt of the Hacienda of Oacalco to grab some of the Tepoztecan lands. To present a stronger legal claim, the local authorities encouraged Tepoztecans to file claims for individual plots of land in the area which was being threatened, so that individual court actions could be lodged against the hacienda if the lands were taken. The private owners of the said lands backed up their newly acquired claims by force of arms, and managed to keep the lands for Tepoztlán. However, despite the Reform Laws of 1857, most of the communal lands of Tepoztlán remained intact and were not converted into private property.

Although the municipio of Tepoztlán held on to most of its communal lands, these lands were under the control of the local *caciques* and, therefore, were not always available to the landless Tepoztecans. Before the Revolution of 1910–20, the *caciques*, with the support of state and federal authorities, prohibited the villagers from using the communal lands in order to assure a cheap labor supply for themselves. One of the most important effects of the Revolution upon Tepoztlán was that the communal lands of the municipio became open to all Tepoztecans.

Another important change in the status of the communal lands occurred shortly after the Revolution as a result of the National Ejido Program. On April 24, 1921, a group of Tepoztecans, led by members of the colony of Tepoztecans in Mexico

[8] Manuel Miranda y Marrón, "Una Excursión a Tepoztlán," *Anales del Museo Nacional*, Bk. 2 (1905–06), pp. 22-23.

2:Lewis E-5 (1943-1948)1951 NU37 Tepoztlan NU37

City, appealed for *ejido* lands for the landless families in the village. The petition for *ejidos* asked that the lands of the neighboring Hacienda of Oacalco, which had taken Tepoztecan lands in the eighteenth and early nineteenth centuries, be restored.

After almost ten years of petitioning and investigations, the request was finally granted, and by a presidential order of November 24, 1929, Tepoztlán received in restitution 2,100 hectares of land from the Hacienda of Oacalco. Of these 2,100 hectares of land, 200 were unirrigated land cultivable only during the rainy season, 500 were forest lands, and 1,400 were scrub forest lands suitable for mixed grazing.[6] This meant that there were only 200 hectares of cultivable land available for distribution in individual *ejido* plots. In addition to these lands, there have recently been other so-called *ejido* grants. In 1937 and again in 1940, the Departamento Agrario created *ejidos* out of portions of the communal lands and allotted these lands to individual Tepoztecan families.

The working out of the Agrarian Reform Laws and of the *ejido* program in Tepoztlán has not been without difficulties. It has led to a conflict between municipal and *ejido* authorities. In the past the communal lands were under the jurisdiction of the local municipal authorities. However, the presidential order of November 24, 1929, gave Tepoztlán the lands it had lost and included a clause which stipulated that in the future the communal lands, as well as the lands granted to the municipio as *ejidos*, were to be under the jurisdiction and administration of *ejido* authorities.

This order violated an old and well-established tradition which had received legal expression in the laws of the state of Morelos, whereby control of all communal lands was vested in the municipal government. Shortly after the presidential decree was passed, conflicts between the newly created *ejido* authorities and the municipal authorities broke out. The municipal authorities insisted in their right to control the communal lands, and when the *ejidatarios* refused to recognize this authority, they were jailed. The sending of federal troops to the village was threatened, to straighten out the confusion. Legally and technically the point of view of the Departamento Agrario won out, thereby weakening local authority.

One of the results of the change in authority is that the very scanty income of the municipio has been further reduced. It may be noted that this trend from local to national authority over communal lands began in 1926, when the Forestry Department took over responsibility for controlling and preserving the forest resources of the nation. Since that date, Tepoztecans who want to cut or burn wood for charcoal must, in theory, obtain the permission of the forestry authorities and pay the tax set by them. However, as we shall see later, in practice there are many violations; and at the time of this writing there is a flagrant disregard of any authority whatsoever in the making of charcoal.

Another conflict resulting from the *ejido* program in Tepoztlán is that between the *tlacololeros*, who have traditionally depended upon the communal lands for hillside agriculture, and the newly created *ejidatarios*. These two have come to be

[6] Most Tepoztecans think of this land as part of the communal holdings; only the arable portion is called *ejido*.

2:Lewis E-5 (1943-1948)1951 NU37 Tepoztlan NU37

423 665 578 separate interest groups, with the *ejidatarios* taking over, for private use, lands which have traditionally been worked by *tlacololeros*. The latter viewed with alarm this encroachment by the *ejido* authorities and formed an organization to defend their interests. This group is known as *comuneros*, in distinction to the *ejidatarios*, and has received official recognition as such by the Departamento Agrario. Each of these groups has become a political faction of weight in the village.

423 311 621 628 In theory any individual from any one of the eight villages of the municipio has the right to use the communal lands anywhere in the municipio, provided he obtains the permission of the municipal authorities, or, as at the present time, the forestry and *ejido* authorities. But in practice each of the eight villages has come to consider certain lands, generally those nearest the village, as its own. Thus, moral boundaries have developed and are today recognized by all concerned. For example, the people of the little village of Santo Domingo jealously guard "their monte" from use by other villagers, but especially from the inhabitants of San Juan, who depend heavily upon woodcutting to earn a living. Similarly, although all *texcal* lands are technically communal property, the villagers of Gabriel Mariaca have prevented Tepoztecans from opening *ducos* in "their *texcal*."

[63] In recent years, conflicts over the use of communal lands have set village against village within the municipio and have seriously weakened municipal bonds. The increasing exploitation of communal resources for commercial rather than for subsistence purposes, which was encouraged by the railroad and the highway, made for competition which did not exist before. This led to a demand of the outlying villages for sole rights of control of adjoining communal lands. In effect the villages were demanding that the moral boundaries be accepted as legal boundaries, thereby interpreting the communal lands as village rather than municipio lands.

[63] 423 631 628 578 314 474 [439] [648] One of the first serious difficulties between the village of the municipio began in the early twenties when the village of San Juan—taking advantage of the proximity of the railroad which ran through the village, and because of its very limited agricultural resources—began to develop the charcoal industry on a commercial scale and to export large quantities of charcoal to Mexico City. In 1926 the villagers of San Juan organized a forestry cooperative to meet the requirements of the national forestry law of the same year. The authorities of Tepoztlán at once challenged the right of the inhabitants of San Juan to exploit municipal resources for the exclusive benefit of a single village. The people of San Juan disregarded the prohibitions of the local authorities and appealed their case directly to the national government. The dispute was bitter and led to some violence. It was finally settled by the intervention of federal authorities, who ruled in favor of the municipio.

In March, 1930, the village of Tepoztlán then organized another cooperative—this time in the name of the municipio and theoretically open to all, but actually controlled by Tepoztecans—and continued to produce charcoal on a large scale. Government files for the next five years are full of complaints from the surrounding villages of the municipio to the effect that the Forestry Cooperative was not truly a municipal organization, but was dominated by the village of Tepoztlán in the in-

2:Lewis E-5 (1943-1948)1951 NU37 Tepoztlan NU37

423 631 628 578 474 314 177 terests of a small clique within that village. The schisms created by this cooperative within the village and the municipio will be treated later in this study. These facts indicate the strong individualism of the villagers, and the interesting way in which new contacts with the outside and production for the market have disrupted the earlier stability of the municipio. As long as production of charcoal was primarily for household use, there seemed to be no conflict between collective ownership and individual exploitation of the resources. As a matter of fact, the communal lands have been one of the few unifying factors in the life of the municipio and have brought the villagers together to defend their lands in the face of threats from the outside. However, with commercial exploitation of the limited communal resources, competition became intense, and the concept of communal land ownership by the municipio was attacked.

PRIVATE HOLDINGS

423 175 As we have indicated earlier, private landholdings include most of the lands for plow agriculture; that is, most of the level lands. The only other privately owned lands are the house sites in the village, most of which include some ground for a garden and for some corn plantings. The history of private landholdings is not very clear. Certainly we know that private holdings have existed at least since the time of the Conquest. Whether or not it existed in Tepoztlán before the Conquest cannot be determined, but, judging from the data for other parts of Mexico, it is probable that private holdings coexisted with other holdings. Much of the land that is now privately owned, approximately one hundred hectares of the most productive lands of the municipio, once belonged to the church. This land was divided into private holdings after the Revolution of 1857. Most of the landowners now have some document to prove title; but there are still many individuals who work plots of land which have been passed down from family to family without any written proof of ownership.

423 55 183 The ownership of land is one of the basic aspirations of Tepoztecan peasants, and land-ownership is perhaps their most important single criterion of wealth. The value put on land-ownership is reflected, in part, by the fact that farmers, artisans, and merchants invest in land whenever they have the necessary capital and the opportunity. But there is no concentration of land-ownership in the hands of a few. There are several reasons for this. Few people in Tepoztlán will sell tillable land, and when they do they prefer to sell to close relatives. On the whole there is little land turnover. Tepoztecans with sufficient capital to purchase large quantities of land do not do so, because they seek more profitable kinds of investments, generally in cattle. The high cost of labor and the low and uneven yields in plow agriculture make corn production for commercial purposes unprofitable.

DISTRIBUTION OF PRIVATE HOLDINGS

183 According to our findings, only 36 per cent or 311 of the 853 families in the village own private land. Thus, in a village where the family ideal is to own a plot

2:Lewis E-5 (1943-1948) 1951 NU37 Tepoztlan NU37

of land, we find that 64 per cent of the families own no private land. The distribution of privately owned land is shown in Table 20.

TABLE 20. Distribution of Privately Owned Land by Family Units and House Sites, 1944.

Barrio	House Sites	Family Units	Families Owning Land		Families With Two Members Owning Land	Families With Three Members Owning Land	Families Not Owning Land	Families Not Owning Land Who Live With Landowners
			No.	Per Cent				
San Miguel	163	214	83	38.3	12	1	131	21
La Santísima	139	185	62	33.5	6	..	123	17
Santo Domingo	174	223	61	27.4	..	..	162	21
Santa Cruz (large)	67	82	44	53.6	5	..	38	10
Los Reyes	37	49	30	61.2	1	..	19	3
San Sebastián	34	42	11	26.2	1	..	31	3
Santa Cruz (small)	29	36	10	26.1	..	..	26	3
San Pedro	19	22	10	41.4	..	..	12	3
Tepoztlán	662	853	311	36.4	25	1	542	81

On the whole, the smaller barrios have a larger proportion of landowners. The outstanding exception is San Sebastián, by far the poorest barrio in the village. It should be noted that Los Reyes, one of the smaller barrios, has an extremely high percentage of landowners and is known as one of the richer barrios. On the other hand, Santa Cruz (large), which shows a high percentage of landowners, is known as one of the poorer barrios. Similarly, the large barrios which here show a low percentage of landowners have some of the wealthiest families in the village. In other words, the distribution of land-ownership is not in itself an accurate index of barrio wealth. Our data, however, do show that the largest number of landless families are in the center barrios.

The small number of families in which two or more members own land points to the lack of concentration of land-ownership along family lines, and also reflects the inheritance pattern of not dividing the property until the father's death. The fact that 81 families without land live on the same house site with families who own land tends to modify to some degree the picture of landlessness, for most of these 81 families are married sons living with their fathers and working for them.

SIZE OF PRIVATE HOLDINGS

The striking thing about landholdings is their extremely small size. This can be seen from Table 21,[5] which shows that 90.6 per cent of all private holdings are less

[5] Private holdings here refer to what Tepoztecans call *propriedad rústica* which is outside of the village, as over against *propriedad urbana* which is located within the village. The latter refers to house sites, some of which have small areas devoted to corn.

2:Lewis E-5 (1943-1948)1951 NU37 Tepoztlan NU37

423 than nine hectares in size, and 68.4 per cent are less than four hectares. The two largest holdings are only between twenty-five and twenty-nine hectares. A man with fifteen or more hectares is considered a large landowner; only 3.3 per cent of holdings are of this size. The smallest holdings, of which there are many, are as low as two *cuartillos* (one-fifth of a hectare) in size.

TABLE 21. Size of Privately Owned Landholdings.

Size of Holdings (Hectares)	Number of Owners	Per Cent of Owners
0–1	109	36.2
1–4	97	32.2
5–9	67	22.2
10–14	18	5.9
15–19	4	1.3
20–24	4	1.3
25–29	2	.7

423 621 The distribution of privately owned land by size of plot and by barrio is shown in Table 22. It is evident from this table that there is a higher proportion of the small holdings (less than one hectare) in the smaller barrios. This is significant in view of the fact that we have seen in Table 20 that there was a larger proportion of landowners in the smaller barrios. For example, although 53.6 per cent of the families of Santa Cruz (large) were landowners, 54.5 per cent of them had holdings of less than one hectare. On the other hand, in the larger barrio of San Miguel, in which 38.3 per cent of its families were landowners, only 18.07 per cent owned holdings of less than one hectare. Furthermore, while Santa Cruz (large) has no landowners with more than nine hectares, San Miguel has eight such landowners.

The greatest extremes in size of holdings are found in the large barrios, with the single exception of Los Reyes, one of the smaller barrios.[6] We have already seen that Los Reyes is also unusual in that it has the highest percentage of landowners. In general, these figures show that there is considerable range in the size of holdings by barrios.

243 423 The size of cornfields is small, because holdings are generally in small parcels located in different places. I have never seen a cornfield in Tepoztlán larger than 35 *cuartillos*, or three and one-half hectares. Although a few of the larger operators plant as much as one hundred *cuartillos* of corn, or approximately ten hectares of land, this would be divided among a number of small parcels. Operators of these larger plots own at least two teams of oxen and have enough capital for hired labor.

EJIDO *HOLDINGS*

423 621 Two hundred and sixty-seven families, or 31 per cent of all families, hold *ejido* grants. It is interesting that most of the cases of two members of a single family

[6] The case of Santa Cruz (small) presents a somewhat special problem; it adjoins the barrio of Santo Domingo and is not literally a separate barrio, for it owes allegiance to Santa Cruz (large).

2:Lewis E-5 (1943-1948) 1951 NU37 Tepoztlan NU37

[p. 121]

TABLE 22. Distribution of Privately Owned Land by Size of Plot, 1944.

Barrio	Hectares of Land														No. of Plots
	0-1		1-4		5-9		10-14		15-19		20-24		25-29		
	No.	Per Cent	No.	Per Cent	No.	Per Cent	No.	Per Cent	No.	Per Cent	No.	Per Cent	No.	Per Cent	
San Miguel	15	18.07	32	38.55	28	33.73	6	7.23	..	..	2	2.41	..	..	83
La Santísima	23	37.09	15	24.20	17	27.43	6	9.68	7	1.61	..	..	..	..	68
Santo Domingo	21	34.42	27	44.26	10	16.40	2	3.27	..	..	..	..	1	1.64	61
Santa Cruz (large)	24	54.54	14	31.84	6	13.64	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	44
Los Reyes	13	43.33	9	30.00	3	10.00	1	3.33	2	6.66	2	6.66	..	..	30
San Sebastián	5	45.45	3	27.27	3	27.27	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	11
San Pedro	4	40.00	4	40.00	2	20.00	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	10
Santa Cruz (small)	4	40.00	3	30.00	1	10.00	..	..	1	10.00	..	..	1	10.00	10
Tepoztlán	109	35.00	107	34.40	70	22.50	15	4.82	10	3.21	4	1.28	2	0.64	317

423
621

2:Lewis E-5 (1943-1948)1951 NU37 Tepoztlan NU37

having an *ejido* grant occurred in the larger barrios, which have controlled the local *ejido* organization from the start of the program. Again, we find a substantial number of families who do not have an *ejido* parcel living with a family who has one.

DISTRIBUTION OF *Ejido* HOLDINGS

The distribution of *ejido* parcels by barrio, shown in Table 23, seems to have been equitable; those barrios which had the smallest percentage of landowners show the largest percentage of *ejido* grants.

TABLE 23. Distribution of *Ejido* Parcels by Families and House Sites, 1944.

Barrio	No. of Family Units	No. of House Sites	Families Holding *Ejido*		Families With Two Members Holding *Ejido*	Families Without *Ejido*	Families Without *Ejido* Living With *Ejido* Holders
			No.	Per Cent			
San Miguel	214	163	61	28.4	3	153	13
La Santísima	185	139	39	21.0	1	146	14
Santo Domingo	223	174	99	44.3	6	124	19
Santa Cruz (large)	82	67	24	29.2	..	58	5
Los Reyes	49	37	11	22.4	..	38	2
San Sebastián	42	34	15	40.4	1	27	2
Santa Cruz (small)	36	29	10	27.7	..	26	3
San Pedro	22	19	8	36.3	..	14	1
Tepoztlán	853	662	267	31.30	11	586	61

SIZE OF *Ejido* HOLDINGS

The size of *ejido* parcels is shown in Table 24. *Ejido* holdings are also small; all are less than three hectares in size. Also, the larger barrios have the greatest number of larger holdings. If we compare the average size of *ejido* holdings with the average of the entire state of Morelos, we find that Tepoztlán holdings are somewhat smaller; the average *ejido* parcel in crop land, for the state as a whole, is four hectares.

PRIVATE AND EJIDO *HOLDINGS*

In the foregoing we have discussed private landholdings and *ejido* holdings separately. But there is some overlapping, since many holders of private land also have *ejidos*. Of the 267 families holding *ejidos*, 109 families also hold private land, and the remaining 158 have only *ejidos*. The way in which private and *ejido* holdings are distributed by barrio is shown in Table 25. It will be seen that 384 families neither own private land nor hold *ejido*. This reveals the land poverty of the village, as far as plow culture is concerned. The large number of landless people and the small size of landholdings result from shortage of tillable land, rather than from concentration of land-ownership in the hands of a few individuals.

2;Lewis E-5 (1943-1948) 1951 NU37 Tepoztlan NU37

423 ●
621

TABLE 24. Distribution of *Ejidos* by Size of Plot, 1944.

Barrio	Hectares						
	0-1		1-2		2-3		Total
	No. of *Ejido* Plots	Percentage of *Ejido* Plots	No. of *Ejido* Plots	Percentage of *Ejido* Plots	No. of *Ejido* Plots	Percentage of *Ejido* Plots	
San Miguel	17	27.87	37	60.66	7	11.47	61
La Santísima	6	15.38	33	84.62			39
Santo Domingo	37	39.21	60	58.82	2	1.97	99
Santa Cruz (large)	10	41.67	12	50.00	2*	8.33	24
Los Reyes	5	45.45	6	54.55			11
San Sebastián	9	60.00	6	40.00			15
San Pedro	3	37.50	5	62.50			8
Santa Cruz (small)	3	30.00	7	70.00			10
Tepoztlán	90	33.70	166	62.17	11	4.49	267

TABLE 25. Distribution of Privately Owned Lands and *Ejido* Parcels by Families, 1944.

Barrio	Total No. of Families	No. of Families Who Own Private Land	No. of Families Who Hold *Ejidos*	No. of Families Who Own Private Land and Hold *Ejidos*	No. of Families Who Have Neither Private nor *Ejido* Land
San Miguel	214	59	37	24	94
La Santísima	185	46	23	16	100
Santo Domingo	223	24	62	37	100
Santa Cruz (large)	82	29	9	15	29
Los Reyes	49	23	4	7	15
San Sebastián	42	9	13	2	18
Santa Cruz (small)	36	9	9	1	17
San Pedro	22	3	1	7	11
Tepoztlán	853	202	158	109	384

RENTAL OF LAND

427
[675]

Land is rented both on a cash and corn basis, depending upon the owner's choice. Rental agreements may be made on a verbal or a written basis. In 1947, a twelve-*cuartillo* plot of fair land rented for about 50 centavos a *cuartillo*, the value in corn would be about 150 to 200 pesos. Widows, who regularly rent out their land, generally ask for payment in corn. Despite the land shortage in Tepoztlán, more land is sometimes available for rent than there are people to rent it. This is primarily due to the lack of capital. Many families own no oxen, and very few can afford to pay for the rental of oxen in addition to the rental of land. And there is always the risk of a poor crop. In cases of crop failure, renters are supposed to make good, but many simply break their contracts. This leads to quarrels but rarely to legal action.

[675]
[686]
[578]

2:Lewis E-5 (1943-1948)1951 NU37 Tepoztlan NU37

427 A man who pays his rent despite crop failure earns the reputation of being *muy honrado* (very honorable) and is sought as a renter.

There is no sharecropping as such in Tepoztlán. When rental is in corn, there is a fixed quantity of corn agreed upon in advance, rather than a percentage of the crop. The landowner, therefore, takes little risk.

LAND VALUES

● 423 435 178 [458] [669] The price of most agricultural lands, that is, the lands which Tepoztecans classify as second and third class, has increased more slowly than other lands, as can be seen in Table 26. During and immediately after the Revolution of 1910-20, land prices fell sharply. Many sold their land at any price in order to stave off starvation, and land parcels changed hands for a small quantity of corn. Since 1920, land prices have been rising steadily. This rise was accentuated by the new road which, with the influx of tourists who have sought land for summer homes, has made for a phenomenal rise in the price of house sites in the village. Distance from the road and from the central plaza, and proximity to one of the twenty-six water fountains, are the most important factors affecting the price of land.

TABLE 26. Land Prices From 1901 to 1944.

Year	Cost of House Sites (in Pesos)		Cost of Arable Land per Hectare (in Pesos)	
	10 to 500 Meters From Water Fountains	500 or More Meters From Water Fountains	Poorest Land	Best Land
1901–1910	60	40	40	60
1911–1920	30	15	10	20
1921–1926	40	25	25	100
1927–1930	70	50	60	150
1931–1935	100	75	120	200
1936–1940	175	125	200	400
1941	300	250	350	450
1942	500	300	400	500
1943	1,000	400	450	800
1944	2,000	1,000	500	1,000

423 432 178 The change in the Tepoztecan attitudes toward selling land to outsiders is one of the most interesting of all changes in the village. Until about 1942, Tepoztecans were very reluctant to sell their land to outsiders. A leading Mexican banker who wanted to build his home in the village had to negotiate for over a year before he could succeed in buying a modest-sized, idle plot of land whose Tepoztecan owner had been residing in Mexico City for many years. Similarly, one of my assistants had to wait for months before she was able to find a plot of land, and then she could only buy one at a considerable distance from the center.

When I returned to the village three years later, a change had occurred; Tepoz-

2:Lewis E-5 (1943-1948) 1951 NU37 Tepoztlan NU37

tecans were looking for land buyers. In the summer of 1947, I was approached by three individuals who wanted to sell me a house plot. However, the high price paid by the Mexican banker and a few other early comers gave Tepoztecans an exaggerated notion of the value of their land. House sites which were worth about 100 to 200 pesos in 1927 now would not be sold for less than 10,000 pesos. This has made a few people wealthy, especially those who were fortunate enough to have house sites fronting the new road.

THE LAND PROBLEM

The land problem in Tepoztlán is not a recent phenomenon. It was at least as severe in the twenties, before the *ejido* grants, and it was certainly more acute before the Revolution. Twenty years ago, the 158 families who now have *ejidos* were landless *peones*. Thus, the *ejido* program in Tepoztlán has had at least two beneficial effects. It has reduced the number of landless families, and it has helped some families, who had insufficient land, to increase their holdings. But the *ejido* program has by no means solved the land problem, for 384 families still remain landless and have little prospect of becoming landowners. Although the *ejido* program brought new and more modern agricultural techniques, there is still not a single tractor in Tepoztlán.

It is apparent that our findings on land-ownership in Tepoztlán differ from those in Redfield's earlier study. Redfield did not mention the existence of a land problem or land shortage in Tepoztlán. Although Redfield gives no clear-cut statement on the matter of land-ownership, and treats the entire subject rather incidentally, there is an implication that each family in Tepoztlán owned its own land. Redfield writes, "Most families have at least a small milpa in which the men are active during the seasons of sowing and harvesting."[7] We have shown that in 1944, 64 per cent of the families owned no private land, and there is no reason to believe that the land situation was any better in 1926. Redfield's use of the term "milpa" is perhaps responsible for what appears to be a sharp difference in our findings. He did not distinguish between a privately owned milpa and a milpa of communally owned land. A Tepoztecan speaks of "my milpa" in referring to rented land, communal land, or private land. Unless the investigator probed further, he might well get the impression that all Tepoztecans were landowners.

Redfield conveyed this impression in another connection. In discussing private lands he wrote,

> Characteristically each *sitio* has an appendant milpa which may be located as much as a mile away from the *sitio:* but the two are usually taxed and inherited together. These tracts are not infrequently sold, but most of them have been in the same family for many generations.[8]

This quotation raises a number of questions. First, Tepoztecans distinguish be-

[7] Redfield, *Tepoztlán*, p. 145.
[8] *Ibid*, p. 61.

2:Lewis E-5 (1943-1948)1951 NU37 Tepoztlan NU37

tween *sitios urbanos* (urban house sites) and *predios rústicos* (rural parcels), and they are listed separately in the property register. Furthermore, a Tepoztecan who owns only an urban house site is not considered a landowner. This, despite the fact that some *sitios* have sufficient land to plant a patch of corn. Traditionally, the house site milpas are used principally for fresh corn. In 1944, however, less than 20 per cent of all house sites were planted in corn, a lower figure no doubt than that prevailing in 1926; as the population is increasing, the house sites are getting smaller because they are usually divided up for purposes of inheritance.

Second, Redfield's statement concerning the "appendant milpa" may refer to an old pattern which has not existed in the village since long before the Revolution of 1910, and I could find only a vague tradition of it remembered by a few older informants. After some investigation of this point I could not find a single example of a house site in the village with an "appendant milpa." The inheritance pattern that prevails today and that, as far as I was able to determine, has prevailed for a long time would rule out the situation of each house site having an "appendant milpa." It is common practice for the father to divide the inheritance, so that the house site goes to one child and the milpa to another.

It is possible that the conception of Tepoztecans as a landed peasantry was taken up from Redfield by Stuart Chase, who described Tepoztlán as a village with economic security. This is especially ironical in view of the fact that Tepoztlán was in the heart of Zapata country and was one of the first villages in Morelos to join the Revolution which, in this region, was essentially a bitter struggle for the land.

It has become traditional among historians, economists, and sociologists, in writing on the history of the agrarian problem in Mexico, to distinguish between two fundamental types of social and economic organization: the so-called free village and the hacienda. The free village represents the older Indian form of organization, and the hacienda represents the Spanish form. Much of Mexican history has been described as a struggle between these two ways of life. One of the best statements on this situation is the following:

> The stage is set. On the one hand is the institution of private property, already present in its incipient forms in pre-Conquest days, but now, with the importation of the *encomienda*, the *peonía*, and *caballería*, fortified, strengthened, and ready to develop in stature and power until soon it stands full grown as the classic type of landed estate—the hacienda. On the other hand is the landholding, communal village rooted deep in age-old custom and tradition and now given life and legal support in the reorganized native pueblo and in the scores of new villages soon to be founded on the Indian model. From this point of view the history of Mexico is, in its most fundamental aspects the drama of the struggle between feudalism and the free village, between the individual private estate and the collective, communal holding-in fine, between the hacienda and the *ejido*. For almost four hundred years it is the hacienda which wins. The victories of the villages are only temporary triumphs; slowly but surely the *ejido* is pushed back and back until by the turn of the twentieth century only in the mountain fastness and in a

2:Lewis E-5 (1943-1948) 1951 NU37 Tepoztlan NU37

few other isolated areas does it still exist. Finally, and at long last, the tide turns, a new chapter is opened and the *ejido* comes into its own or at least, so it would appear.[9]

There can be little quarrel with this summary of the basic process. I think, however, it is useful to recognize that between the isolated mountain villages, which held on to their own lands and were largely free of hacienda influence, and the landless villages, which were literally swallowed up by the hacienda itself, there was a middle type of village like Tepoztlán, which was marginal to the hacienda area and which maintained most of its communal lands in spite of the impact of the hacienda economy. Tepoztlán lost approximately 2,500 hectares of its 25,000 hectares to the neighboring haciendas. Although Tepoztecan economy was not basically changed by the haciendas, they came to be an important source of added income to Tepoztecans. Tepoztlán was a convenient source of labor supply for many haciendas in the state of Morelos, and Tepoztecans were recruited in large numbers.

In the formulation of Mexican history as a struggle between the hacienda and the free village, there has been an understandable tendency to blacken the former and idealize the latter. It is sometimes assumed that the free villages were organized on a democratic basis and that peasants who lived in these villages automatically had access to the communal lands. As we have seen in the case of Tepoztlán, this was not so. Tepoztlán, before the Revolution of 1910, was a highly stratified society in which the well-to-do *caciques* held political power and prevented the peasants, most of whom were landless peons, from utilizing their own communal lands. We do not know to what extent this situation existed in other regions, and this is a point which deserves investigation.

Another aspect of the tendency to idealize the free village has been the assumption that collective forms of land tenure are accompanied by cooperativeness and a form of collectivism in the economic organization of agriculture. As a matter of fact, Tepoztecans, like most Mexican peasants, are a highly individualistic group of farmers, and there is a minimum of cooperativeness or collectivization in the system of agriculture. The existence of collective forms of land tenure, in the face of this individualism, has been responsible for much bickering between the villages. The coming of the railroad and the subsequent increase in production for the market undes a competitive system has further weakened the role of the communal lands as a unifying force.

What light does the Tepoztecan material throw on the working out of the *ejido* program? I think it shows that any evaluation of the *ejido* program in Mexico must carefully distinguish between its effects upon villages which had been landless and those which had retained their communal lands. In villages which had lost their lands, the *ejido* program was obviously a great boon. However, among villages which had retained their communal lands, while the *ejido* helped, it also created new problems.

[9] Simpson, *The Ejido*, p. 15.

2:Lewis E-5 (1943-1948)1951 NU37 Tepoztlan NU37

The *ejido* program in Tepoztlán has meant that 267 families, who were formerly landless, now have some land. However, the size of landholdings is too small to support Tepoztecan peasants according to their own standards. That the *ejido* has not really solved the land problem is of course due in part to the small amount of land that could be distributed, for Tepoztlán is surrounded on three sides by municipios which have their own communal lands. The *ejido* program has also had disruptive effects in the village in that it has created two distinct interest groups, the *ejidatarios* and the *tlacololeros*. Furthermore, taking the control of the communal lands away from the local municipal authorities has eliminated a source of municipal revenue, and thereby weakened local government and initiative. At the same time, it has increased centralism and made the municipio even more dependent upon the outside.

The deforestation occurring in the municipio and the refusal of Tepoztecans to abide by the regulation of the forestry department point up an important problem of more than local scope. Much has been written about the superstitious and backward Mexican peasant who opposes progress and sticks to his ancient way of life. Too frequently the specific reasons which lead to resistance to change are not sufficiently understood.

The case of Tepoztlán is typical. The livelihood of hundreds of Tepoztecan families depends upon hillside hoe culture and charcoal burning, two activities which by their very nature destroy forest resources and bring about soil erosion. Many Tepoztecans are aware that the forest resources are their greatest wealth and that failure to conserve them may lead to eventual ruin. But they are caught on the horns of the dilemma of a rapidly rising population and limited natural resources. It is no less than absurd to expect peasants to abide by rules which would deprive them of their food supply. In the light of the Tepoztecan material, it would seem essential that national programs of forest and soil conservation be carefully synchronized with other programs which will give the people alternative sources of income, if they are to give up hillside hoe culture and charcoal burning.

2:Lewis E-5 (1943-1948)1951 NU37 Tepoztlan NU37

pasture. For this reason, many farmers hire several peons at this time, involving an outlay of cash. At least one peon is often hired during the plowing and seeding and the first cultivation. Farmers not owning oxen and plows must rent them.

The cost of production does not always have relation to the amount of corn produced, because some fields require more work than others. In the specific cases given in Table 33 the larger production was offset by higher costs (about 32 pesos per *carga* in Plot I) and conversely, the plot which required least outlay in cash or labor yielded the least corn (about 24 pesos per *carga* in Plots II and III). Differences in cash value of the corn produced are due to the changes in market price. Those who are forced to sell immediately after the harvest receive lower prices than those who hold on.

HOE CULTURE

The land used for *tlacolol* (hoe culture) is of two distinct types, located in different areas of the municipio. One type is known as *texcal*, which is covered with black volcanic rock and a semi-deciduous scrub forest in which the leaves fall and rot during the dry season and make a rich but thin topsoil in little pockets among the rocks. The other type of land is known as *cerros*, and refers to the mountainsides. Most of the *cerros* used for *tlacolol* are of lime rockbeds with many rock outcroppings and scrub forests, but of a somewhat different nature than in the *texcal*. Both types of land are at some distance from Tepoztlán, so that the farmers who work this land must spend approximately two hours each way in going and returning from work.

The use of the communal lands for *tlacolol* is a fairly recent phenomenon in spite of the fact that Tepoztlán has had its communal lands since pre-Conquest times. Before the Revolution of 1910-20 during the Díaz regime, the well-to-do *caciques* who controlled the political life of the municipio forcibly prohibited the use of the communal lands for *tlacolol*. As we have indicated earlier, their primary motive was to assure themselves of a labor supply for their own lands. One of the principal changes in the economic life of the village brought about by the Revolution was to deprive the *caciques* of their power and to return to the people the right to use their communal lands. But in the years immediately following the Revolution, that is between 1920 and 1927, relatively few individuals became *tlacololeros*. The population of the village was still small and there was a relative abundance of rentable land because of the absence of many families from the village.

In 1927 the municipio lost control of the *tlacolol* lands, which passed to the jurisdiction of the forestry department. At this time Tepoztecans lost their right to work *tlacolol* because the forestry department, as part of its national program of conservation and prevention of soil erosion, forbade the indiscriminate cutting and burning of trees—an integral part of the process of preparing *tlacolol* land for cultivation. With the rapid increase of population in the thirties, the shortage of land became acute and the need for the *tlacolol* land urgent. Many individuals began to open *tlacolol* plots illegally and were fined.

2:Lewis E-5 (1943-1948) 1951 NU37 Tepoztlan NU37

In 1938 a group of Tepoztecans organized themselves to fight for the privilege of working the communal lands. A delegation of 200 men went to the local authorities in Cuernavaca and explained that they had no other way of earning a living. They stated that they would open *tlacolol* even if it meant violence and arrest. Following this demonstration the *tlacololeros* were allowed to work without government interference, and the number of *tlacololeros* increased.

The fact that *tlacolol* land is now available to Tepoztecans is of paramount importance in the life of the community and has served two purposes. First, it has been a source of land for the landless. Together with the *ejido* land recovered from the Hacienda of Oacalco, it has reduced the number of peons and has broadened the agricultural base of the society. It has thereby reduced the sharp social and economic class distinctions which existed in the village before the Revolution.

NUMBER OF *Tlacololeros*

In 1944 there were 189 families, or 20.9 per cent of all the families in the village, in which one or more members worked *tlacolol* land. The distribution of these families by barrio and the extent to which the same families also carried on plow culture is shown in Table 34.

TABLE 34. Distribution of *Tlacololeros* by Barrio, 1944.

Barrio	No. of Families	No. of *Tlacololeros*	No. Who Have *Tlacolol* Only	No. Who Own Private Land Only	No. Who Hold *Ejido* Only	No. Who Hold *Ejido* and Own Private Land
San Miguel	214	45	23	10	8	4
La Santísima	185	34	24	4	5	1
Santo Domingo	223	26	10	5	6	5
Santa Cruz (large)	82	42	14	15	5	8
Los Reyes	49	12	9	1	1	1
San Sebastián	42	21	10	2	8	1
Santa Cruz (small)	36	2	1	1	0	0
San Pedro	22	7	5	1	1	0
Tepoztlán	853	189	96	39	34	20

It should be noted that while over fifty per cent of the *tlacololeros* are in the three larger barrios of San Miguel, La Santísima, and Santo Domingo, they constitute only a very small percentage of the total number of families in these barrios. On the other hand, in the smaller barrios the *tlacololeros* constitute a much larger percentage. Thus, in San Sebastián approximately fifty per cent of the families are *tlacololeros*. This concentration of the *tlacololeros* in the smaller barrios tends to set these barrios off as the poorest and most backward in the village.

It will also be seen from Table 34 that 96 families, or 50.7 per cent of all *tlacololeros*, depended solely upon *tlacolol;* that is, they had no private land or *ejido;* 39 *tlacololeros* owned private parcels; 34 held *ejidos;* and 20 had both private

2:Lewis E-5 (1943-1948)1951 NU37 Tepoztlan NU37

241 423 [178] land and *ejido*. Most of the families who either owned private land or held *ejido* or both and who also worked *tlacolol* had turned to *tlacolol* because their holdings were too small to support their families. But there is a trend among even the better-to-do families to turn back to *tlacolol;* for example, twelve of the twenty families who owned private land, held an *ejido* grant, and worked *tlacolol*, were among the large landowners.

SIZE OF CLEARINGS

Most *tlacolol* clearings are small, averaging between eight and twelve *cuartillos* of seed. The largest *tlacolol* operator in the village plants only thirty-five *cuartillos*. As we shall see, the great amount of labor necessary for clearing *tlacolol* land is the most important limiting factor in the size of clearings used. A related factor, however, is the growing shortage of land which has sufficiently grown back into forest after earlier clearings. Furthermore, *tlacolol* is definitely viewed as subsistence [626] agriculture, and any man who cleared inordinately large areas, even if he could, would incur the wrath of the other villagers.

TOOLS OF PRODUCTION

241 412 Plow and oxen are ruled out in *tlacolol* because of the nature of the terrain. In *texcal* the large volcanic rocks lie around helter skelter, so that it is difficult for a man even to walk. Similarly the steep slopes of the *cerros*, and the lime outcroppings make the plow and oxen impractical. In both types of *tlacolol*, the tools used are the *coa, tlalache, cazala, azadón*, and machete. (See Fig. 29.) They are homemade [438] except for the iron tips in the hoe and machete, which are bought. Thus, in con- [422] trast to farmers in plow culture, most *tlacololeros* own their own tools. The cost of the *tlalache* and the *coa* are shown in Table 35.

[435]

TABLE 35. Cost of *Tlalache* and *Coa*, Tools Used in *Tlacolol*.

Year	Cost in Pesos	
	Tlalache	*Coa*
1926	1.50	1.25
1935	2.25	1.75
1940	3.00	2.25
1944	5.50	3.25

WORK CYCLE AND PRODUCTION TECHNIQUES

243 *Preparation of Land:* Work in *tlacolol* begins in January. The trees are cut with an ax, and the bush is cleared with a machete, extremely difficult and time-consuming work. It takes approximately 40 to 50 days for a man to clear enough land for the planting of 12 *cuartillos* of corn. The trees and brush dry out and are burned in April, and the ashes are left to "fertilize" the soil. Burning is generally done in a single day with two or three men working together. If the materials are not all burned, the group will return and work another day. Enclosures of rocks

2:Lewis E-5 (1943-1948)1951 NU37 Tepoztlan NU37

both plots, the most obvious difference in production time is in clearing and fencing the land. Due to the rougher terrain, clearing and burning in *texcal* are more difficult and time-consuming than in *cerros*. On the other hand, because of the greater threat from grazing cattle, the building and repairing of fences are more time-consuming in the *cerros*.

Estimated costs of production based upon the same two plots clearly demonstrate the wide range in costs which prevails in Tepoztlán. (See Table 37.)

TABLE 37. Estimated Cost of Production of Corn in *Tlacolol*, 1944.

Operation	Pesos Spent in *Tlacolol* Clearing					
	Texcal (10 *Cuartillos*)			*Cerro* (7 *Cuartillos*)		
	Hired Labor	Own Labor	Total	Hired Labor	Own Labor	Total
Clearing with machete and ax		60.00	60.00		31.50	31.50
Fencing with poles		18.00	18.00	17.50	17.50	35.00
Burning		12.00	12.00		1.50	1.50
Seeding with *cavalo*		18.00	18.00		10.50	10.50
Reseeding		3.00	3.00		3.00	3.00
Seed			3.00			2.10
Seed for reseeding			.40			.20
Weeding by hand		54.00	54.00	21.00	60.00	81.00
Repairing fence					39.00	39.00
Harvesting		18.00	18.00		12.00	12.00
Transporting corn	15.00		15.00	22.50		22.50
Shelling corn		22.50	22.50		13.50	13.50
Total	15.00	205.50	223.90	61.00	188.50	251.80
Amount and value of corn produced	15 *cargas* at 30.00 each		450.00	9 *cargas* at 30.00 each		270.00
Total cost and value			223.90			251.80
Net profit			226.10			18.20

The lower yields and higher costs of producing corn in the *cerro tlacolol* as compared with the *texcal tlacolol* make the *cerro* less economical to work, and it is also more time-consuming. But since the families who work *tlacolol* are for the most part subsistence farmers, our comparisons of the relative profits involved in each type are strictly for purposes of analysis.

PLOW AND HOE CULTURE COMPARED

Now that we have examined both plow and hoe culture, as they are carried on in Tepoztlán, let us compare the two systems in some of their more important characteristics. We have seen that there are more families engaged in plow culture than in *tlacolol*, and that there is overlapping in that some families participate in both systems. The distribution of the families who work private holdings, *ejido*

2:Lewis E-5 (1943-1948) 1951 NU37 Tepoztlan NU37

holdings, and *tlacolol* is approximately as follows: 36 per cent of all families operate private land; 31 per cent operate *ejido* parcels; and 20.9 per cent operate *tlacolol*. Since both *ejido* and private parcels employ plow culture, it is evident that the *tlacololeros* constitute by far the smallest group. Hoe culture is secondary in importance to plow culture from the point of view of the number of families engaged in each. This is seen even more clearly when we recall that all but 96 of the *tlacololero* families had an *ejido* parcel, a private milpa, or both. However, *tlacolol* is still very important in the total economy of the village.

One of the most striking differences between the two systems is the much greater amount of time necessary in hoe culture. It will be seen from Table 38 that it takes approximately two-thirds more man-days to produce one hectare of corn in *tlacolol* than it does in plow culture. As we have seen, the single job of weeding by hand takes more time than all three cultivations with plow. The great difference in the total time spent in preparation of the land is also noteworthy. The somewhat longer time period for harvesting and transport is due to the greater distances of *tlacolol* fields from the village and the larger relative production of the *tlacolol* milpas. It should be noted that fencing the *tlacolol*, which is so time-consuming, has to be repeated each time a new *tlacolol* is opened—in contrast with the permanent stone fences of private milpas and *ejidos*.

TABLE 38. Comparison of Time Spent in Production of Corn in Plow and Hoe Culture.

Operation	Man-Days Spent on Plot of One Hectare	
	Plow Culture	Hoe Culture (Tetzcal)
Preparation of the land	8.0	60
Planting	2.8	16
Cultivation	14.0	30
Harvest	15.0	12
Transporting corn	3.0	10
Shelling Corn	5.0	15
Total	47.8	143

In addition to the differences in the actual time spent there is a corresponding difference in the nature of the work. Tepoztecans who have worked in both types consider work in *tlacolol* infinitely more exhausting than work in plow culture. The *tlacololeros* are in a sense perpetual pioneers who are always making new clearings in the forest. Also, weeding by hand is very difficult and leaves welts for days on the hands of the toughest *tlacololero*. It is said in the village that a *tlacololero* is known by his hands.

Another very important point is the difference in time pressure demanded by each system of agriculture. On the whole there is much less time pressure in *tlacolol*. A man can clear his land anytime between January and April. He can work for a few days at clearing, spend a few days doing some other job, and then return to

2;Lewis E-5 (1943-1948) 1951 NU37 Tepoztlan NU37

suffering, and maladjustment. We are told little of poverty, economic problems, or political schisms. Throughout his study we find an emphasis upon the cooperative and unifying factors in Tepoztecan society. Our findings, on the other hand, would emphasize the underlying individualism of Tepoztecan institutions and character, the lack of cooperation, the tensions between villages within the municipio, the schisms within the village, and the pervading quality of fear, envy, and distrust in inter-personal relations.

Now let us consider some of these differences in more detail. Redfield's account of Tepoztlán stresses the role of the communal lands as a unifying factor within the village and the municipio. While this is certainly true it is only part of the story. With the single exception of church lands, communal lands were and are individually operated, and the ideal of every Tepoztecan is to own his private plot of land. Furthermore, the communal lands have been a source of inter-village quarrels, and during the year that Redfield was in Tepoztlán these quarrels resulted in violence. Similarly, Redfield gives the impression that the *cuatequitl*, a traditional form of collective labor, was part and parcel of village life. He described a *cuatequitl* which occurred during his stay as if it were a common and regular occurrence. As a matter of fact, it was the first village *cuatequitl* of importance since the Revolution, and there have been very few subsequent ones. The particular *cuatequitl* which Redfield observed was due to the curious circumstance whereby a local, socialistically oriented political faction, directed from Mexico City by a group of Tepoztecans who were members of the Confederación Regional de Obreros Mexicanos, locally known as the Bolsheviki, revived the traditional *cuatequitl*. Before the Revolution, the village *cuatequitl* was not viewed simply as a voluntary, cooperative endeavor but was also associated with forced labor and imposition by the local *cacique* groups which ruled the village during the Díaz regime. In the colonial period the Spaniards similarly utilized the traditional *cuatequitl* as a source of labor. In short, Redfield's account of the cooperative aspects of village life needs to be modified somewhat in the light of other data.

Redfield portrayed Tepoztlán as a community of landowners and did not mention a land problem. But we found that over fifty per cent of the villagers did not own private land, and that there was an acute shortage of good land and considerable population pressure in the face of dwindling agricultural resources. Redfield gave a rather glowing picture of Tepoztlán during the Díaz regime as having reached a period of great cultural florescence, but he failed to point out that this was limited to only a few Tepoztecans, and that the vast majority of Tepoztecans were illiterate, desperately poor, landless, and living under an oppressive political regime which forbade them to utilize their own communal resources. In this connection it is interesting to note that Tepoztlán was one of the first villages in the state of Morelos to join the Zapatista revolt against the Díaz regime. Redfield apparently viewed the Mexican Revolution as having had the effect of halting the tendency for

3:Lewis E-5 (1943-1957) 1960
NU37 Tepoztlan NU37

tional source of income by the prohibiting of charcoal production. Members of the lower segments of this group have gained least from the processes set in motion by the Mexican Revolution. They have been unable or unwilling to leave the village for jobs in the cities or to work as *braceros*. They have taken least advantage of the greater educational opportunities. They continue to farm for subsistence and cling to the old ways of life largely because these are cheaper.

As Tepoztlán moves further into the modern world, it is leaving behind its Indian language, many of its Indian customs, its local autonomy and the collective forms of pre-Hispanic times. Even the communal lands—the bulwark of the traditional order and formerly one of the most important bases for the corporate life of the community—seem destined to be divided up into *ejido* plots, and perhaps later into private holdings. With improved means of communication, greater faith in technology, greater dependence on a money economy and outside jobs, increasing occupational specialization, and a desire for a higher level of living, a change has come about also in the character of the people. As we have seen, Tepoztecans are now less suspicious, less withdrawn, and more concerned with personal development.

Tepoztlán today poses many questions which can be answered only with time. Will the growing individualism bring greater anxiety and frustration? Will it bring greater participation and trust in government? Will the traditional patterns of village life be able successfully to incorporate and reinterpret the present new elements—as has often been done with new elements in the past—or will the old and stable village culture soon be unrecognizable? Will Tepoztecans continue to sell their ancient lands and thereby convert Tepoztlán into a miniature Cuernavaca? Will the recent arrival of electricity be followed by the establishment of factories and the growth of a landless proletariat? Or will the village culture absorb the industrialism that seems to be on its way as some other villages have done?

Changes in village culture are exemplified in changing styles.

[p. 104 not processed]